

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9-16, 20-26, 29-32 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b) over Hobbs (US Patent No. 5,197,138). Also, claims 6-8, 17-19, 27-28, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hobbs in view of Radhakrishna (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,414). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to claims 1, 25 and 29, the Office Action cites Hobbs at column 2, lines 54-57, to anticipate the “interrupt threshold value” limitation. The cited portions of Hobbs do not teach, or even suggest, this limitation. In the cited portions, Hobbs merely teaches that “an interrupt will not be recognized or serviced by the processor until the priority of the code thread is lower than the priority of the interrupt.” (Emphasis added). See Hobbs column 2, lines 54-57. Hobbs does not even suggest “processing a requested interrupt only when [the/an] interrupt priority value of the requested interrupt is higher than the interrupt threshold value” as explicitly recited in claims 1 and 29. Also, Hobbs does not teach only accepting “interrupts having an interrupt priority higher than the interrupt threshold value,” as recited in claim 25. Therefore, claims 1, 25 and 29, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over Hobbs.

Regarding the rejection of claims 22 and 23, Applicant has integrated the limitations of claim 23 into claim 22, and canceled claim 23. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the “common threshold interrupt value,” as recited in amended claim 23, is not taught, or even suggested, by Hobbs.

Claim 24 explicitly requires “processing traps only in the active threads originating the traps.” In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner cites column 2, lines 22-32, of Hobbs. The cited portion of Hobbs merely defines a trap, it does not teach the

above-mentioned limitation in claim 24. Calling a trap by a software interrupt, as taught by Hobbs, is different from "processing traps only in the active threads originating the traps," as required by claim 24.

With respect to the obviousness rejection of claims 6-8, 17-19, 27, 28, 33 and 36 over Hobbs in view of Radhakrishna, the addition of Radhakrishna does not cure the deficiencies of Hobbs in teaching or suggesting the use of an "interrupt threshold value," as explicitly required by the claimed invention.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant